

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, MAY 18, 1912

No. 27

ENGLISH AND THE LATIN QUESTION

(Concluded from page 203).

Inevitably, therefore, the study of the origin and development of literary forms in English leads us back to Latin. The English drama struggling out of the Middle Ages remains crude and half-articulate till it is reenforced and inspired by contact with Seneca and Terence and Plautus. Formal English satire arises when Joseph Hall and John Marston apprentice themselves to Juvenal and Martial and Persius. The investigator of the sources of English prose fiction cannot neglect Petronius and Apuleius. Bacon, the essayist, points a significant finger over the head of Montaigne to the Roman moralists. As soon as one begins to consider Spenser's eclogues, if not before, one must begin to consider Vergil. Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline epigrammatic, lyric, and elegiac verse perfects itself in emulation of Ovid and Horace, of Catullus and Propertius and Tibullus. Ben Jonson's critical theories develop and crystallize under the influence of Quintilian and Horace. English epic attains speech and form divine in *Paradise Lost* only after a great classical scholar has spent a life time in intimate companionship with Vergil and Homer. English epistolography is indebted to Cicero's correspondence with Atticus, and so late as the eighteenth century we find an English slave-trader, later to be known as the eminent divine John Newton, sending love letters to his wife from the west coast of Africa under the inspiration of Pliny. Even the masters of pulpit eloquence, those who developed the English sermon, learn many of their arts under pagan Roman rhetoricians. And Burke, the most philosophical of English orators, and one of the noblest of English statesmen, acknowledges that he has formed his character on the model of Cicero.

IV

As a consequence of this situation—of these facts of literary history—the student of English literature is continually confronted with definite and important problems to the understanding of the terms of which acquaintance with Latin is absolutely prerequisite. Let us set down a few of these problems in rather concrete form by way of illustration:

1. In the sixteenth century English stylists are divided into two groups: the vernacular party and the classical party—a division which continues well into the seventeenth century. What are the specific

issues? Unless the student can recognize for himself the difference not merely between words of Anglo-Saxon and words of Latin origin but also the difference between, say, the style of Cicero and the style of John Bunyan, he cannot proceed one step beyond the naked assertion of text-book or teacher. Without Latin, and Latin in the original, he cannot realize the issues.

2. In the same period began a long controversy about rhymed and rhymeless verse, and about the quantitative and accentual verse systems. Unless the student has at least scanned his Vergil, it is vain labor to present the matter to him.

3. Shakespeare, let us say, represents romantic comedy; Jonson consciously opposes him with classical comedy. What is the essential nature of the opposition? If your student knows not at least a play or two of Terence or Plautus, he cannot feel the significance of Jonson's appeal to the authority of the ancients. He must remain in the dark concerning the conflicting dramatic movements after 1600—concerning the force of that profound impulse which in the end produced Restoration comedy.

4. Even elementary text-books speak of the classical school of seventeenth century lyric poets. Why 'classical'? If your student has never read an Horatian ode, an epigram of Catullus, an elegy of Tibullus, if he cannot catch the echoes of these elder singers, perceive the likeness of spirit and form in the songs of Ben and his 'sons', in Herrick and Carew and Suckling—this distinction becomes pedantic sound and fury signifying nothing.

5. The age of Anne is commonly called the Age of Classicism. Scholars who know their Greek and Latin classics prefer to call it the age of pseudo-classicism. Once more, why 'pseudo'? Obviously it is of the highest importance to clear thinking to be able to compare, if only on a small scale, the literatures on which that distinction is based.

If we are unable to deal with such problems as these, we must abandon all pretensions to critical study; we cannot claim for the study of English any high seriousness or philosophical depth. If we neglect these problems, we neglect everything that gives distinctive features and character to the face of English literature. We cannot pass over the Latin element, and attend to the native element alone; because, to all intents and purposes, the native element never is alone. English literature is not composed of a bundle of independent parallel

forces; it is the resultant of forces uniting at many points and from many angles. What makes it distinctive is not this or that stream but the confluence of many streams of influence—to which Latin is almost always a heavy contributor. English poetry in particular is a Euphorion uniting the richest and most varied ancestral strains—the novel and unexpected offspring of an Anglo-Saxon mother by a Latin father descended from a Greek, cradled by a Celtic godmother, nursed by a French aunt, educated by an Italian governor, and converted by a Hebrew prophet. When an English poet is writing as nearly as possible in a pure native tradition, he gives us something like the *Battle of Maldon*. When Christian religious culture is united to his native seriousness he gives us the *Piers Plowman*. But when the whole mediaeval stream with its freight of Greek and Roman stories, popular superstitions, Celtic folk-lore, French chivalry, and the rest sweeps into the classical stream of the Renaissance, then first our English poet can give us the Elizabethan lyric, the *Fairy Queen*, and the *Midsummer Night's Dream*. Consider for a moment how the ends of the earth meet and all times melt together in this exchange of views between Shakespeare's Titania and his Oberon:

Titania:
When thou hast stolen away from fairy-land
And in the shape of Corin sat all day,
Playing on pipes of corn and versing love
To amorous Phillida. Why art thou here,
But that, forsooth, the bouncing Amazon,
Your buskin'd mistress and your warrior love,
To Theseus must be wedded, and you come
To give their bed joy and prosperity.
Oberon: How canst thou thus for shame, Titania,
Glance at my credit with Hippolyta,
Knowing I know thy love to Theseus?
Didst thou not lead him through the glimmering night
From Perigenia, whom he ravished?
And make him with fair Aegle break his faith,
With Ariadne and Antiopa?

This is not Greek nor Latin nor Celtic nor Saxon; it is the full blown flower of English poetry. But you cannot inhale its bewildering fragrance unless you can remember in one divine confusion the enchanted fields of fairyland and the wide wilderness of classical mythology. Is it not a shame to cast such pearls before students who have never read Ovid?

But the remorseless modernist roaming up and down the jungles of educational theory does not hesitate to declare that we have outgrown Shakespeare as we have outgrown Latin. There is this shadow of a dismal truth in what he says: In proportion as we forget and ignore the Latin classics we shall find all our great elder writers growing obsolete and inaccessible. To the modernist this peril brings no dismay. 'Who reads Shakespeare, anyway?' he cries cheerily. 'Let our boys and girls

have a poet of their own time, interested in the ideas and emotions that interest them. Let them read Tennyson!' Of course, we cannot retreat from Latin by that avenue. Nor can we leave Latin behind, and read with real intelligence any important English poet. For all great poetry, like the lost face of Leonardo's *Mona Lisa*, is haunted and subtized by memories, fixed or fleeting, of old unhappy far-off things and battles long ago. It is a hall echoing the voices of forgotten singers, and tremulous with the lights and shadows of all the ages. It is but the magical arch through which we peer into time's dark backward and abysm; if we are not seeing through and beyond it, we are not seeing it at all. 'Why have people ceased to care for poetry?' runs the tedious refrain. Because—if the question is a fair one—they have ceased to understand it. Because they cannot rise to the level on which poetry has its being. They have ceased to understand it, because, having neglected the ancient Classics, they have lost their share in the common stock of traditional thoughts, images, and feelings in which formerly every educated man participated. Reading English poetry, therefore, no more can yield them its legitimate pleasure and reward by uniting them with the impassioned history of human experience which it is the special function of great poetry to preserve.

For the sake of the modernist, let me illustrate what I mean with the aid of a few lines from the *Passing of Arthur*—the five quiet lines closing the *Idyls of the King*. After the body of the dying Arthur, borne in the enchanted barge with the three queens of faerie, had drifted out to sea, Sir Bedivere, last of the knights, climbed the crag by the wintry mere, hoping to catch one more glimpse of his sovereign. When he had reached the highest point, straining his eyes Sir Bedivere saw, says Tennyson,

Or thought he saw, the speck that bare the king
Down that long water opening on the deep
Somewhere far off, pass on and on, and go
From less to less and vanish into light.
And the new sun rose bringing the new year.

Now, what was Tennyson thinking and feeling when he wrote that final line—*And the new sun rose bringing the new year*? Out of what depths of memory and experience do those simple words rise into consciousness, and break on the shores of light—*dias in luminis oras*? What is the effect of that line upon the duly prepared reader? What did Tennyson—classical scholar, like all our English poets—have a right to expect it to do? Well, he had a right to expect that it would link itself, subtly but instantaneously with the close of the second book of the *Aeneid*—

*Iamque iugis summae surgebat Lucifer Idaee
ducebatque diem, Danaïque obsessa tenebant
limina portarum, nec spes opis ulla dabatur:
cessi et sublato montes genitore petivi.*

He had a right to expect that his echo of this Vergilian music would transport us for a moment to the ridges of Mt. Ida after the desolation of the royal city of Priam; that with expanded vision and sympathies we should enter into the solemn reflections of Aeneas looking before and after—backward, over the burning towers of Ilium and the pomp of Homeric times into the world's pale unhistoric morning—forward, down the long imperial vista of Roman history melting insensibly into the Dark Ages; that there we should stand on another ridge with another hero, mythical and symbolical like the first—behind us, the dim Arthurian realm receding vaguely into the glimmering Celtic twilight—before us, the distant and confused roar of the "drums and trappings of three conquests", the far reaches of English history widening gradually and brightening down to our own little span of light and time; that, standing here with these tidal memories streaming through us, we, too, should feel ourselves to be but myths and symbols, momentary links between the shadowy past and the new day; and that so we, too, should become sharers and communicants in the world's melancholy—the *lacrimae rerum*, and the world's hope—"the prophetic soul of the wide world dreaming of things to come".

This, I say, or something like this, happens to the reader who is sufficiently versed in the rudiments of general culture to be prepared to understand and enjoy English poetry. What happens to the reader who is not so prepared, I cannot say; I suppose nothing in particular happens. Till a fairly recent date it has hardly been necessary to raise the question. For it may be said without much exaggeration that, till recent years, no one setting up for an educated man would have admitted without humiliation that this passage failed to recall for him the "glory that was Greece, the grandeur that was Rome". Reflect, for example, on the significance of this bit of advice from Lord Chesterfield, that shrewd man of the world, to his son on the study of the Classics: "Pray mind your Greek particularly; for to know Greek very well is to be really learned: there is no great credit in knowing Latin, *for everybody knows it; and it is only a shame not to know it*". On this point Samuel Johnson, who was notoriously not a lover of the earl, was wholly in accord with him. While the Doctor and his biographer were travelling one day by sculler to Greenwich, Boswell inquired whether "he really thought a knowledge of Greek and Latin an essential requisite to a good education". To which Johnson promptly replied: "Most certainly, Sir; for those who know them have a very great advantage over those who do not. Nay, Sir, it is wonderful what a difference learning makes upon people even in the common intercourse of life, which does not appear to be much connected with

it". For the sake of argument, Boswell continued to urge that people can get through the world and carry on their business successfully without learning. Johnson conceded that in some cases this might be true—"for instance, this boy rows us as well without learning, as if he could sing the song of Orpheus to the Argonauts, who were the first sailors". He then called to the boy, says Boswell "What would you give, my lad, to know about the Argonauts?" and the boy answered, "Sir, I would give what I have"—a reply which was rewarded with a double fare as an indication that the lad's sense for 'educational values' was correct! If Johnson and Chesterfield should visit our universities to-day, what would be their comment on the position which Greek and Latin hold in the curriculum? Doubtless they would marvel together on the multiplication of businesses, other than sculling, which may be prosecuted successfully "without learning". Perhaps also they would agree once more, and declare that it is easier now to pass for an educated man than it ever was before in the world.

V

I am confident that such would be their verdict, if they considered the results of a little experiment which I have recently made upon some 400 university freshmen and sophomores chosen at random from the colleges of liberal arts, law, engineering, and agriculture. For the purposes of this paper the results of this experiment may be summarized briefly in the form of 'laws' as follows:

A. A student's power over the English dictionary varies directly with the number of years in which he has studied Latin.

B. A student's acquaintance with the commonplaces of classical allusion varies directly with the number of years in which he has studied Latin.

C. A student's ability to read a page of Shakespeare varies directly with the number of years in which he has studied Latin.

Though I shall proceed to show from what data these conclusions were drawn, these 'laws' are not to be read with too solemn a face; regard them, if you please, as convictions of the author supported by a certain amount of general observation and specific evidence.

(1) For the test on vocabulary I made a list of sixteen words of Latin derivation, as follows: temporizing, subservient, concatenation, concomitant, decorum, exculpation, latent, mitigate, extenuate, plenipotentiary, retrospective, taciturnity, matricide, dormitory, incarnation, mortification (this is not a harder list than that recently employed for testing jurymen in Chicago). I gave this list to 216 students, and asked them to define the words in a simple way—if possible, with reference to the meanings of their roots. When I had graded the papers, I arranged them in five groups: writers in the first

group had studied no Latin; in the second group, one year; in the third, two years; in the fourth, three years; in the fifth, four years. Those who had studied Latin four years reached an average grade of 40 per cent; three years, 35 per cent; two years, 29 per cent; one year, 23 per cent; no Latin, 20 per cent. That is, those who had four years of Latin were twice as efficient as those who had none; and the difference between one and none was practically negligible.

The blunders were both numerous and suggestive. They revealed with remarkable plainness the nature of the disastrous psychological accidents that occur to those who pick up the meanings of words from the context, and do not examine the roots. The most instructive illustrations are afforded by the various definitions or synonyms for *incarnation*. A foreign student rejoicing in the Christian name of a Greek dramatist defines *incarnation* as, "the way J. C. was born from the Virgin Mary"—the context is obvious. A second writes, "referring to animals after death"—evidently a confusion with reincarnation. A third, "filled with badness"—perhaps suggested by some such phrase as "the incarnation of evil". A fourth, "fierce, horrible"—apparently related to "a fiend incarnate", or "an incarnate devil". A fifth, "bloodshed"—associated with "carnage". A sixth, "the occasion on which a king is crowned"—"coronation". A seventh, "the name of a certain occasion" (sic)—"coronation" as before, but foggier. Four of these students had studied Latin two years; three of them, not at all. A little timely etymologizing in a Latin course would have saved them from several kinds of error. As it is, they will probably go forth into the world and poison the wells of English till they die.

(2) To this same group of 216 students I gave a list of names familiar in Roman history, poetry, and mythology, and asked for brief identifications: Plautus, Aeneas, Vulcan, Horace, Diana, Hector, Mercury, Cicero, Vergil. I asked also for the approximate dates of Caesar, Hannibal, and Vergil; for comment on the propriety of certain words of Latin derivation in English sentences—e. g., "The air of spring is *redolent* with the song of birds"; and for the analysis of an English sentence. Taking the paper as a whole, including the test on vocabulary, I obtained the following results:

Years of Latin Study.	Grade.	Number of Papers.
4	48%	21
3	39%	29
2	33%	45
1	24%	29
0	24%	92

To take a single instance of a classical author, 154 out of 216 students had no idea whatever concerning Horace; here are a few specimen guesses:

"a Greek historian", "a fictional Greek", "a Greek god", "a Greek orator", "a character of mythology". That is valuable information. It means that to a large majority of the miscellaneous students in elementary English courses, it is mere jargon to mention, say, "the Horatian ideal"; it means that I may as well speak of the jabberwockian attitude toward life as to speak of the Horatian spirit of the eighteenth century; it means that I am merely adding one confusion to another when I try to explain the movement of seventeenth century poetry by reference to the classical influence. The distribution of those who had heard of Horace in my five groups was as follows: four years, 62%; three years, 41%; two years, 31%; one year, 25%; no Latin, 17%.

Of the 92 students who had no Latin, one third, approximately, had heard of Diana. One thirteenth, or seven in all, could identify Aeneas. Of Cicero, I learn that he was "a Greek philosopher", "a Greek general", "a great Grecian poet", "the greatest Grecian poet"—a character which would certainly have been grateful to Cicero! Hector is described as "a Grecian princess who was stolen by the Troy prince, thus causing the war". Dido was "queen or king and went to Africa". Aeneas was a protean creature—"the lover of Vergil—lived 1000 B. C.", "one of the goddesses in favor of the Trojans", "god of the winds", "goddess of the hearth". Caesar, it appears, lived "500 A. B."; the writer has studied no Latin, but knows at least the value of an academic A. B. A sophomore student of agriculture without Latin writes: "Caesar lived 1200 B. C.; Hannibal still earlier; Vergil, no idea". This man, to whom a thousand years are as yesterday, can define no one of my sixteen English words. He knows none of the historical or mythological names. At the foot of his paper he adds this postscript: "If I had time, I should like to study Latin, a knowledge of it would be very *handy* in the sciences, but since it is of no practical value I do not see why it is studied by so many students". When I meet this student, I shall reassure him on this last point—the numbers are not large enough to occasion any great apprehension.

But what is the effect of this agricultural attitude toward Latin upon the student of English literature? Simply this: when you set him down before the *Fairy Queen* or *Paradise Lost*, he discovers, or you discover, that he is unable to study English. Language, images, allusions, form—all is as Hebrew to him. He must begin, as Spenser and Milton began, by studying Latin—but at a long remove from the proper sources of information. He cannot be reasoned with in his state of innocence about the special qualities of the versification, the literary sources or affinities of the poem, its representative character, its rich and magical suggestiveness and beauty. He cannot pluck the fruit of the tree with-

out climbing the trunk. He must now at last open the pages of some Who's Who? in classical mythology—breathlessly inquire who Hector was? who Helen? who Dido? who Aeneas?—cast a hurried glance at Olympus, scrape a momentary and undignified acquaintance with Jove—and rush into class with the news.

But that is not studying English, though, alas, it passes under that name in too many of our class rooms. It is not even tasting English. It is merely making a futile attempt to conceal one's ignorance of the Classics. For when a boy comes to the Fairy Queen or to a play of Shakespeare or to Paradise Lost, all these things should lie in his mind as rich and splendid reminiscences. This post haste culture of the eleventh hour is, moreover, generally valueless. At the end of the year, all that this boy will know of the gods of the elder world could be engraved in full on an English penny.

(3) I support this assertion in part by the results of the second half of my investigation. I had a page of the Merchant of Venice typewritten and distributed to 198 students. It was the exquisite passage between Jessica and Lorenzo in the first scene of the fifth act, beginning

The moon shines bright. In such a night as this,
When the sweet wind did gently kiss the trees
And they did make no noise—in such a night
Troilus methinks mounted the Trojan walls
And sigh'd his soul toward the Grecian tents
Where Cressid lay that night.

So it runs on, Jessica and Lorenzo capping reminiscences, and living over again under the moonlight the passionate moments of vanished lovers—Dido and Aeneas, Pyramus and Thisbe, Medea and Jason. The tritest eternal commonplaces!—household words, familiar in our mouths as the names of Washington and Lincoln. I asked each student to name the author, the dates of his birth and death, and the play from which the lines were taken; to describe the meter; to explain the allusions; and to comment on the literary quality of the selection. Somewhat to my surprise a very large per cent placed the passage, named the author, dated him, and described the metre correctly. But only a very few of those who had studied Latin less than three or four years could explain any of the allusions. And only those who could explain the allusions could say anything at all about the literary quality. The scale of percentages for my five groups ran on this test parallel with that on the first:

Years of Latin Study.	Grade.	Number of Papers.
4	40%	38
3	30%	34
2	24%	43
1	17%	42
0	17%	41

The 17% earned by the last two groups represents

mere memory work applied to dates, verse-form, etc., and indicates no understanding or appreciation of the poetry, whatever. So far as my figures have any value, they tend to show that a man may as well try to reach England without a boat as to attain proficiency in English without Latin. This conclusion is in general confirmed by my daily experience in the classroom. If other teachers of English do not assent, than we probably differ as to the values which should be realized in the study of English.

STUART P. SHERMAN.

REVIEW

Roman Stoicism. By E. Vernon Arnold. Cambridge (England): at the University Press, 1911. Pp. xii + 468. \$3.15.

Professor Arnold has collected between the covers of his book a very large amount of information about the Stoics. He has evidently made himself familiar with every important reference to their opinions which is accessible to the persistent explorer. From the first chapter to the last it is his vast knowledge of sources which is impressive, and from the first chapter to the last, it is the use of this knowledge which is disappointing; for while he proposes, in his Preface, to regard "Stoicism as the bridge between ancient and modern philosophical thought", he has produced a book which is more like an ancient *placita* than it is like a modern history. It gives the content of Stoic doctrine topically arranged, but not an interpretation of Stoicism historically construed.

There are seventeen chapters in the book, a very complete bibliography of ancient and modern writers, a general index, and a Greek index. The first five chapters have the titles, The World-Religions, Heraclitus and Socrates, The Academy and the Porch, The Preaching of Stoicism, and The Stoic Sect in Rome, and are apparently intended to be introductory. The last two, Stoicism in Roman History and Literature and The Stoic Strain in Christianity, suggest, but do not afford, something like an historical estimate. The intervening chapters summarize the opinions of the Stoics on the themes about which they were wont to discourse, such as Reason and Speech, Sin and Weakness, The Universe, The Kingdom of the Soul, etc. The whole work is subdivided into numbered sections, each dealing with a topic subordinate to the principal theme of the chapter in which it occurs. A section, taken at random, will illustrate the general character of the author's method and exposition, whether he is writing about "Socrates" or "mythologic Christianity".

Fire, heat, and motion are ultimately identical, and are the source of all life. Thus the elemental and primary fire stands in contrast with the fire of

domestic use; the one creates and nourishes, the other destroys. It follows that fire, though it is one of the four elements, has from its divine nature a primacy amongst the elements, which corresponds to its lofty position in the universe; and the other elements in turn all contain some proportion of fire. Thus although air has cold and darkness as primary and essential qualities, nevertheless it cannot exist without some share of warmth. Hence air also may be associated with life, and it is possible to retain the popular term 'spirit' for the principle of life. In the development of the Stoic philosophy we seldom hear again of air in connexion with coldness; and between the 'warm breath' (*anima inflammata*) and the primary fire there is hardly a distinction; we may even say that 'spirit' has the highest possible tension (p. 180).

Seven foot-notes, citing Cicero, Areius Didymus, Augustine, and Seneca, support this paragraph. Comparing these notes with the text, the reader discovers that the text itself is little else than these notes arranged as a connected narrative. This quoted section is typical. Paragraph after paragraph presents a variety of statements collected from a number of different authors and arranged as a more or less logically connected narrative of Stoic opinions. Fully half the sentences in the book end in an index figure which refers the reader to the source from which the statements they contain are drawn. And this method of exposition characterizes even the chapter on Stoicism in Roman History and Literature. There is this section devoted to Seneca:

In the reign of Nero the Stoics are still more prominent, and almost always in opposition. Seneca, of course, the emperor's tutor and minister, is on the government side; and from his life we can draw the truest picture of the imperial civil servant in high office. We shall certainly not expect to find that Seneca illustrated in his own life all the virtues that he preached; on the other hand we shall not readily believe that the ardent disciple of Attalus and affectionate husband of Paulina was a man of dissolute life or of avaricious passions. Simple tastes, an endless capacity for hard work, and scrupulous honesty were the ordinary marks of the Roman official in those days, as they are of the members of the Civil Service of India to-day. Seneca is often accused of having been too supple as a minister; but he was carrying out the principles of his sect better by taking an active part in politics than if he had, like many others, held sullenly aloof. He did not indeed imitate Cato or Rutilius Rufus, who had carried firmness of principle to an extent that laid them open to the charge of obstinacy; but in submitting frankly to power greater than his own he still saw to it that his own influence should count towards the better side. For the story of his political career we can not do better than to refer to the latest historian of his times; of his work as a philosopher, to which he himself attributed the greater importance, a general account has been given above and more particular discussions form the central theme of this book (pp. 394-395).

This section is preceded and followed by others of a similar character devoted to other men and the collection of these sections constitutes the chap-

ter. The writer tells us in the note that supports the "simple tastes, endless capacity for work, and scrupulous honesty of the Roman official" that "for the British official the authority of the author of *Tales from the Hills* will suffice".

Now one may treat a great historical theme like Stoicism after this fashion, if one has a mind to, although such a treatment is not likely to prove either inspiring or illuminating. But if one chooses this fashion in these days of historical criticism, one ought to show some appreciation, not only of the fact that our sources are not equally reliable, but also of the more important fact that sources can be understood only in their historical context; they ought not to be used like proof-texts, irrespective of the character of their times and the character of their authors. Seneca may be a good authority on which to base praise of Roman officials, and Kipling may suffice for a similar service for the British, but neither can be taken without criticism. And it is in just such necessary criticism that this book of Professor Arnold's is glaringly defective. What is to be said of the critical acumen of an author who credits Aristotle with affirming that the Druids and Semnothei taught philosophy to the Gauls and Celts, and cites Diogenes Laertius as his authority! Is it likely that any one can form a just conception of the Stoic doctrine of 'quality' by simply putting together statements taken even from such authorities as Simplicius, Galen, Plutarch, Alexander of Aphrodisias, and Zeller? It is this uncritical use of authorities, this viewing them *sub specie aeternitatis*, that makes even a topical presentation of Stoicism unconvincing and ineffective. It may and does yield a wealth of material for critical study, but it does not, to borrow words from Professor Arnold's opening section, help us "to look on literature as an unveiling of the human mind in its various stages of development, and as a key to the true meaning of history". Stoicism deserves the kind of study which these quoted words suggest but such a study will begin where Professor Arnold ends, and will seek to envisage Stoicism, not as a body of doctrine, but as the moral and religious enterprise of men, who, through many centuries and under diverse fortunes, carrying a weight of tradition and superstition, sought a philosophy of life which might satisfy the soul and shed light on a weary world.

FREDERICK J. E. WOODBRIDGE.

Columbia University.

NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The last luncheon of The New York Latin Club for 1911-1912 was held April 27 at Hotel Gregorian. The meeting was very large and enthusiastic, the theme under consideration being The Promotion of

Greek Studies in our Schools and Colleges. The guests of honor were Professor Gilbert Murray of Oxford University and Lady Mary, his wife.

Professor Murray spoke on the present outlook for Greek in England and America and some means we should employ to further classical education. He recognizes that the great industrial and national progress of the present century has engrossed popular attention to the neglect of cultural studies. But the things of life may be grouped under two heads: things that change, and things that do not change, things of permanent value; the Classics belong in the second group. The beauty of great poetry never wanes.

There is no real antagonism, Professor Murray said, between the best classical teaching and science teaching of the best sort, for both are seeking to kindle in the minds of youth reverence for truth and distrust of sham. Superficiality is the foe common to both. Classical studies lead upward to the higher levels of education. They are aristocratic, in the commendable use of the word, conferring distinction, not of birth but of breeding, not of wealth in money but of wealth in mind. In seeking to perpetuate Greek in our Schools and Colleges teachers should not confine their efforts to easy methods of instruction, for disciplinary value is indissolubly linked with thoroughness, but the work should be made as interesting as possible.

The child of poor parents who has native ability and ambition to attain unto the best in education should somehow be given the chance to study Greek. Scholarships and prizes for classical attainment stimulate to the highest effort and afford the winner further opportunity for study and gain, the consent of parents otherwise unwilling for their children to study Greek.

As a comforting word of cheer to all of us who are timid or discouraged, Professor Murray used the exhortation of Aeneas:

O socii, neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum,
o passi graviores, dabit deus his quoque finem.

In proposing a vote of thanks to the speaker, Professor Knapp remarked that, though the long pilgrimage to Europe to see the remains of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, to visit the libraries and the museums of Europe, and to hear European scholars, is for many wholly impossible, and to none possible often, classical teachers in this country are after all fortunate in that Europe is more and more frequently sending her scholars to us. He passed on to express, not only for those present, but for many others who had attended Professor Murray's recent lectures at Columbia, their pleasure at being privileged to hear one whose "lectures were not only informed always with soundest scholarship, but irradiated with the divine inspiration of true poesy". In conclusion he spoke as follows: "Quas

propter res, domine Praeses, pro Societate Latina Neoeboracensi censeo ut hospiti nostro viro illustrissimo, eruditissimo, utriusque linguae doctissimo, qui de rebus classicis et in Europa et in America optime meritus est, gratias maximas nos omnes ad unum—immo vero ad unum unamque—agamus, atque, si Graeca quoque lingua verba pauca nunc loqui mihi licebit, χάριν μελίστην ἀποδῶμεν."

Professor Whicher of Normal College seconded the motion in a highly witty and entertaining speech. In the discussion which followed Professor Lodge remarked that the cheapening of the A.B. degree by giving it to those who know no Greek and little Latin is responsible for the great decline in the number of students pursuing Greek. Because of a popular demand in the interest of public health, manufacturers of food stuffs are now compelled by law to put honest labels on their products; but many Colleges mislabel their products and so confuse the public mind. There are degrees in plenty—B.Sc., B.Litt., B.Ph.—for them to choose an appropriate one to label a Greekless graduate; but no, they label an inferior article with an A.B., which has always been the stamp of graduates in the humanities. After his forceful plea for standardizing the A.B. degree, Dr. Lodge spoke of the desirability of endowing College scholarships as prizes for pupils of greatest attainments in Greek.

Miss MacVay of Wadleigh High School said it had long been the desire of the Executive Committee of the New York Latin Club to encourage Greek in preparatory schools by means of scholarships and accordingly offered the following motion: "That The New York Latin Club shall undertake at once to raise funds necessary for establishing one or more scholarships whereby graduates of our city schools who attain highest rank in the Regents' examinations in Greek may continue their classical studies in college; and that these Greek scholarship funds shall be safe-guarded and administered in the same manner as our Latin scholarship fund is now managed". Dr. Tibbetts of Erasmus Hall High School seconded the motion, and gave a brief history of the Latin Scholarship and of its influence in quickening an interest in Latin in our schools. The motion was passed unanimously.

The Committee on Nominations reported through its chairman, Dr. Ball of the College of the City of New York. The following officers were elected: President, Professor Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University; Vice-President, Dr. Edward C. Chickering, Jamaica High School; Secretary, Miss Josie A. Davis, Morris High School; Treasurer, Dr. Wm. F. Tibbetts, Erasmus Hall High School; Censor, Miss Anna Jenkins, Girls High School Brooklyn.

All contributions to the Greek Scholarship fund should be sent to Dr. Tibbetts, Treasurer.

ANNA P. MACVAY, Censor.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 325 West 120th Street, New York City.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

The Best Known Classical Teacher in England

Dr. W. H. D. ROUSE

Head Master of the Perse School, Cambridge

Editor of The Classical Review

will give two courses on

The Oral or Direct Method of Teaching Latin

- (1) Demonstration Class in Oral Teaching.
- (2) Teacher's Class in Oral Practice.

Teachers' College, Columbia University

Summer Session, July 8—

August 17, 1912

For the announcement, address the
Secretary of Teachers' College

Caesar for Sight Reading

By Towle and Jenks
CLOTH .40

This book includes the most interesting portions of Caesar, and is so carefully edited that the class which has been well drilled on the first two books of the Gallic War will be able to read this readily and with pleasure. Special stress is laid on acquiring a vocabulary.

D. C. Heath & Company

Boston

New York

Chicago

HALE'S LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION

By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, Head of the Latin Department, University of Chicago.

Cloth, 50 cents.

The book plans as much material only as can be written in one year; this is assumed to be one lesson a week. The entire ground may therefore be covered without leaving gaps in the pupil's study of constructions. The work is confined to those constructions which are common in Caesar. The sentences are not longer than those in other books, but they follow the narrative, are continuous, and are sensible. The book contains a vocabulary, and most helpfully arranged tables of case-uses and mood-uses. References are given to all the grammars in common use.

ATKINSON, MENTZNER & COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago

Dallas

D'Ooge's Latin for Beginners

D'Ooge's Latin for Beginners was selected for this school because it met most nearly our ideas of a book giving the right emphasis to vocabulary, forms, and syntax. Pupils of average ability handle the book with ease.

ELLA L. BALDWIN, *Instructor in Latin*,
High School, Bridgeport, Conn.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

NEW YORK

PEARSON'S ESSENTIALS OF LATIN

Exactly simple and clear, exact and scholarly. Makes first year Latin study more profitable and more pleasant because better conceived, better organized, and better directed.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

MARKED VOWELS

NOTES AT FOOT
OF STUDY PAGE

SEPARATE PAPER
TEXT

ADDITIONAL SIGHT
READING

These distinctive features
are found in

WALKER'S CAESAR

JOHNSTON & KING-
ERY'S CICERO

KNAPP'S VERGIL

DO YOU KNOW THESE BOOKS?

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

623 South Wabash Ave., Chicago

37 East 28th St., New York

AN EDITION OF SELECTIONS FROM OVID'S METAMORPHOSES

Edited for High Schools by

C. W. Bain, Professor of Ancient Languages in South Carolina College, and recently Head-Master of the Sewanee Grammar School of the University of the South.

One thousand verses set apart for sight-reading. Word-groups included which increase the vocabulary. Introduction contains a discussion of the laws of scan-sion.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

PUBLISHERS

BOSTON
CHICAGO

64-66 Fifth Avenue
NEW YORK

DALLAS
SAN FRANCISCO